REMARKS

The applicants have carefully considered the Office action of July 8, 2008. By way of this response, claims 1-14, 17, 18, 20, 24, 25, and 27 have been amended. In view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, the applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application.

Interview Summary

The undersigned would like to thank Examiner Haoshian Shih for the telephonic interview conducted on September 25, 2008. The language of the Office action was discussed. Specifically, the undersigned and the Examiner Shih agreed that page 3, line 10, which reads "Moyne does specifically disclose that the HCI signals having different codes" should read "Moyne does **not** specifically disclose that the HCI signals having different codes" (emphasis added). Examiner Shih stated that the incorrect phrase was the result of a typographical error.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Moyne et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,109,979) in view of Vogeley et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,633,691). As amended, independent claim 1 recites a method including encoding a first human-computer interaction (HCI) signal with a first code to correspond to a first HCI position event and encoding a second HCI signal with a second code to correspond to a second HCI position event. Further, independent claim 1 recites that the first code and the second code differ to indicate a difference between a first time at which the first HCI position event occurred and a second time at which the second HCI position event occurred. Moyne et al. and Vogeley et al. independently and collectively fail to describe such a method.

As stated in the Office action, Moyne et al. does not describe HCI signals having different codes. See, *the Office action dated July 8, 2008, page 3*. To cure the deficiencies of

Moyne et al., the Office action asserts that Vogeley et al. describes HCI signals having different codes. *Id.* However, Vogeley et al. does not describe a system in which HCI signals are encoded with different codes to indicate a difference between a first time at which a first HCI position event occurred and a second time at which a second HCI position event occurred, as recited in claim 1. Rather, Vogeley et al. states that "different types of pulse code modulation…could be utilized such that the system is responsive to multiple stylus locations or functions, e.g., erase, draw red, draw green, etc." See, *Vogeley et al., column 7, lines 21-25.* In other words, Vogeley et al. states that different modulations can be used to identify different modes of operation associated with the stylus or different locations of the stylus. Thus, while the codes described by Vogeley et al. will differ in response to the stylus being in a different locations or being set to a different modes of operation, the codes of Vogeley et al. do not indicate at time difference between HCI position events, as claimed.

In contrast, the method recited in claim 1 causes the codes to differ in response to indicate a different time of a position event. A first transmission occurring at a first time will be encoded with a first code and a second transmission occurring at a second time will be encoded with a second, different code. Such a method enables base components receiving the transmissions to, for example, distinguish between times at which different received transmission occurred and/or a sequence in which the transmission originated.

Because both Moyne et al. and Vogeley et al. fail to describe or suggest a system in which HCI signals are encoded with different codes to indicate a difference between a first time at which a first HCI position event occurred and a second time at which a second HCI position event occurred, no combination of these references can include a system in which HCI signals are encoded with different codes to indicate a difference between a first time at which a first HCI position event occurred and a second time at which a second HCI position

event occurred. Accordingly, neither Moyne et al., Vogeley et al. nor any combination thereof can render independent claim 1 unpatentable. Therefore, the §103 rejection of claim 1, along with the rejections of all claims dependent thereon must be withdrawn.

Similarly, independent claims 10, 17, and 24 recite a method of, or a device to encode a first HCI signal with a first code to correspond to a first HCI position event and to encode a second HCI signal with a second code to correspond to a second HCI position event. Further, independent claims 11, 17, and 24 recite that the first code and the second code differ to indicate a difference between a first time at which the first HCI position event occurred and a second time at which the second HCI position event occurred. For at least the reasons stated above, neither Moyne et al., Vogeley et al. nor any combination thereof can render independent claims 10, 17, or 24 unpatentable. Therefore, the §103 rejection of independent claims 10, 17, and 24, along with the rejections of all claims dependent thereon must be withdrawn.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency in the amount enclosed (if any) or any additional fees which may be required during the pendency of this application to Deposit Account No. 50-2455.

Respectfully submitted,

HANLEY, FLIGHT & ZIMMERMAN, LLC
150 South Wacker Drive, Suite 2100
Chicago, Illinois 60606

November 7, 2008

/Daniel J. Glitto/
_____

Daniel J. Glitto
Registration No. 58,996
Attorney for Applicant(s)